EXHIBIT 9

HAJIM
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
& APPLIED SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

RANGA P. DIAS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
HOPEMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING, Room 220
P.O. BOX 270132
ROCHESTER, NEWYORK 14627

TEL : (585) 276-4112
FAX : (585) 256-2509
Email: *rdias@rochester.edu*

August 18, 2023

Via Email: wendi.heinzelman@rochester.edu
Wendi Heinzelman
Professor and Dean
Edmund A. Hajim School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
University of Rochester, Lattimore 309
Rochester, NY 14627

Dear Prof. Heinzelman,

I am writing in response to recent information conveyed to me regarding the decision to reassign my students from my laboratory and appoint my contracted personnel, Dr. Sachith Dissanayake, in a new capacity at the University of Rochester.

Concerning Dr. Sachith Dissanayake, his contractual engagement was established within my laboratory, supported by external funding allocated to both me and my lab. It was previously confirmed that the University of Rochester actively recruited him away from my laboratory, offering a new position accompanied by funding separate from my support. It is my understanding that Dr. Sachith Dissanayake has accepted this solicitation, thereby terminating his contractual obligations to my lab. Consequently, I acknowledge his discontinuation of involvement in any projects associated with my laboratory, along with the cessation of his access to equipment and materials therein. I am also cognizant of the preservation of my intellectual property rights pertaining to all research endeavors previously undertaken by Dr. Sachith Dissanayake as contracted personnel within my lab. It is my expectation that any proprietary information or intellectual property that he was privy to during his tenure in my lab shall not be employed in his new role at the University of Rochester. Kindly communicate any points of disagreement with the aforementioned understandings, to facilitate a constructive dialogue concerning the transition of Dr. Sachith Dissanayake from his former role in my lab to his new position at the University of Rochester.

Subsequently, I wish to address recent discussions I had with my graduate students. These students have expressed a desire to continue their work within my laboratory, yet they were not accorded this option. On the contrary, these students were informed that continuing to collaborate with me was not viable. Regrettably, no rationale was provided to them for the termination of their involvement in my lab. They communicated to me that they were directed by the University to seek alternative departments or advisors. While they express apprehensions about their well-being and prefer to remain anonymous, I am mindful of their concerns and will respect their wishes.

Although these students have expressed their intention to continue their involvement in my lab, they acknowledge the absence of choice and are disconcerted by the prospect of dissenting from the University's decision. Their initial meeting outlined that working with me was not a

feasible path forward, and subsequent discussions focused on identifying alternative arrangements. This course of action undertaken by the University has jeopardized their ability to complete their PhD studies in a conducive environment aligned with their research interests. Even if these students were reinstated in my lab for their PhD pursuits, they harbor concerns that the University's actions could recur, further impinging upon their studies. It has also been brought to my attention that this approach may necessitate a reinitiating of their PhD endeavors, thereby amplifying the adverse impact on their mental well-being.

As previously articulated, my reservations extend beyond the decision to reassign my students, encompassing the perceived absence of due process in the execution of this decision. The directive provided to students to locate new departments or advisors, devoid of an opportunity for informed deliberation, diverges from policies aimed at granting students the autonomy and freedom to make such determinations. Rather, the way students were guided toward new avenues appeared intimidating, leaving them with a sense of predetermined outcome. This approach inadvertently casts a shadow of presumption on my actions, implying wrongdoing that warranted the abrupt separation of my students. Regrettably, this dynamic has cast doubt on the objectivity of the ongoing NSF/U of R investigation.

In instances where students removed from my lab express an interest in resuming their work, will the University honor their choice? Similarly, if I consider the recruitment of postgraduate scholars for my lab, will the University acknowledge my decisions? Your insights on these matters will be appreciated.

Despite the University's deviation from the Faculty Handbook and principles of transparency, and its actions resulting in prejudice to existing contractual relationships, ongoing investigations, and my professional and personal standing, my commitment to fostering effective communication and upholding principles of impartiality, fairness, and comprehensive assessment remains unwavering. I am confident that we can collaboratively pursue a just resolution to these concerns through internal deliberations, obviating the necessity for external intervention.

Sincerely,

Ranga P. Dias

cc: Renato Perucchio (rlp@me.rochester.edu)
Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Program Director, Archaeology, Technology, and Historical Structures
236 and 415 Hopeman
Rochester, NY 14627